

AMENDMENT under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln. No. 10/003,170

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-4, 6-10, 12 and 16-21 are all the claims pending in the present application and stand rejected. Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

CLAIM REJECTIONS.

35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 10, 12, 16 and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,636,361 to Ingerman. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as Ingerman clearly fails to teach or suggest a memory device having the partitioned memory as claimed.

While the Office Action alleges Applicant's own specification which states that memory device 30 may be one or more memory types....infers that more than one unit is present, the Office Action ignores the portion of Applicant's specification, which points out the deficiency of using dedicated caches for each processor as taught by Ingerman. (Specification pg. 2, ll. 16-18). It is respectfully submitted that Applicant's specification when considered as a whole (e.g., Figs. 1-3) relates to the use of an individual memory device 30, 230, 330 having a memory array partitioned in the manner claimed. Accordingly, since Ingerman fails to teach or suggest this limitation of claims 10, 12 and 16-21 these claims cannot be anticipated by Ingerman. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3-4, 6-9 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,140,681 to Uchiyama in view of U.S. published application 2002/0184445 to

AMENDMENT under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln. No. 10/003,170

Cherabuddi and/or Ingerman in view of Cherabuddi. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for the following reasons.

With respect to claims 1, 3-4 and 6-9, it is respectfully submitted that the cited prior art, even if it were appropriate to combine the references as suggested (*arguendo*), fail to teach or suggest the first second and third partitions recited in the claims. Most notably, Cherabuddi, which is relied upon as disclosing dynamically altering a size of the first and second portion of the memory array, does not disclose this feature. As pointed out by Applicant in previous responses, the size of cache memory partitions 23a-23b of Cherabuddi never changes, only the accessibility of those portions to the respective CPUs depending on whether it is in a 1T state (i.e., one CPU is inactive) or a 2T state (i.e., both CPUs are active). (Cherabuddi Par. 0025) Accordingly, Cherabuddi does not teach or suggest altering a size of memory partitions as alleged in the Office Action and claimed by Applicant. Rather, Cherabuddi ^{discloses} only the use or access of an additional memory partition if it is not being utilized by its respective processor.

Furthermore, with respect to independent claim 10 and the claims which depend there from, neither Cherabuddi nor any cited reference of record teaches or suggests altering a size of the first and second portions while still maintaining exclusivity for access by respective first and second processors.

Ingerman is not deemed relevant by Applicant to any rejection as all pending claims are specifically related to an "individual memory" device rather than a distributed memory system as disclosed by Ingerman.

Since Cherabuddi, Uchiyama and/or Ingerman, taken alone or in combination fail to teach or suggest the foregoing features of Applicant's claims, Applicant respectfully submits *prima facie* obviousness has not been established. In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of all §103 rejections are respectfully requested.


CONCLUSION.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

AMENDMENT under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln. No. 10/003,170

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below. Applicant hereby petitions for any extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee or deficiency thereof, except for the Issue Fee, is to be charged to **Deposit Account # 50-0221.**

Respectfully submitted,


Stuart A. Whittington
Registration No. 45,215
Intel Corporation
(480) 715-3895

c/o
Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP
12400 Wilshire Blvd., Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA. 90025-1026
(503) 264-0967

Date: May 9, 2005